



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

15
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/719,609	12/13/2000	Robert G. Schwartz	770P009579-U	3376
2512	7590	02/07/2005	EXAMINER	
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			COSIMANO, EDWARD R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3629	

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/719,609	SCHWARTZ ET AL.
	Examiner Edward R. Cosimano	Art Unit 3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2000.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-72 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-72 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 13 December 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/13/00.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

1. Applicant should note the changes to patent practice and procedure:
 - A) effective December 01, 1997 as published in the Federal Register, Vol 62, No. 197, Friday October 10, 1997;
 - B) effective November 07, 2000 as published in the Federal Register, Vol 65, No. 54603, September 08, 2000; and
 - C) Amendment in revised format, Vol. 1267 of the Official Gazette published February 25, 2003.
2. Applicant's claim for the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) and/or 35 U.S.C. § 120 is acknowledged.
3. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. § 120/119(e) as follows:
 - A) An application in which the benefits of an earlier application are desired must contain a specific reference to the prior application(s) in the first sentence of the specification or in an application data sheet (37 CFR § 1.78(a)(2) and (a)(5)).
- 3.1 If applicant desires priority under 35 U.S.C. 120 based upon a previously filed provisional application 60/089,212 filed 15 June 1998 (see declaration), specific reference to the earlier filed application must be made in the instant application. For benefit claims under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121 or 365(c), the reference must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) of the applications. This should appear as the first sentence of the specification following the title, preferably as a separate paragraph unless it appears in an application data sheet. The status of nonprovisional parent application(s) (whether patented or abandoned) should also be included. If a parent application has become a patent, the expression "now Patent No. ____" should follow the filing date of the parent application. If a parent application has become abandoned, the expression "now abandoned" should follow the filing date of the parent application.
- 3.2 If the application is a utility or plant application filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) on or after November 29, 2000, the specific reference must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the actual filing date of the application or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. If the application is a utility or

plant application which entered the national stage from an international application filed on or after November 29, 2000, after compliance with 35 U.S.C. 371, the specific reference must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the date on which the national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. See 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and (a)(5)(ii). This time period is not extendable and a failure to submit the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 119(e) and/or 120, where applicable, within this time period is considered a waiver of any benefit of such prior application(s) under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). A priority claim filed after the required time period may be accepted if it is accompanied by a grantable petition to accept an unintentionally delayed claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). The petition must be accompanied by (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 120 or 119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) to the prior application (unless previously submitted), (2) a surcharge under 37 CFR 1.17(t), and (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Director may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional. The petition should be addressed to: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

4. The Abstract of the Disclosure is objected to because:

A) the abstract is not on a separate sheet as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.72(b).

Correction is required. See M.P.E.P. § 608.01(b).

5. The drawings are objected to because

A) the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims, therefore, the subject matter of:

(1) claim 3 in regard to the use of a “counter” to track the version number;

must be shown in the drawings as required by 37 CFR § 1.83(a) or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s) (note: no new matter should be entered).

5.1 Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing

sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

A) applicant must update:

(1) the continuing data on page 1,

with the current status of each of the referenced applications, e.g., --now abandoned--, or --now patent #?--, or --which is abandoned and now serial number #?--, --which is expired--, etc.

B) as required by 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5)) and 37 CFR § 1.121(e) the specification lacks an explicit reference to the nature of:

(1) how the program proceeds after box(es):

(a) 809 of fig. 8A if the inquiry is "NO" in the paragraph located between page 18, line 13, and page 19, line 7, "It should also be noted that the above ... reconfiguration process. After the access entry verified at step 809, computer 105 at step 812 establishes a communication connection with data center 125 via modem 120. Through the ... record pertaining to franking system 100.".

In this regard, it is noted that merely mentioning either a feature or a number without mentioning the device or operation or number or feature relies on the drawing to

provide support for the disclosure and not to aid in the understanding of the invention, as is the purpose of the drawings (37 CFR § 1.81(a,b)).

C) the following errors have been noted in the specification:

(1) from the declaration filed 13 December 2000, it appears that applicant is claiming the benefit of an earlier filing date for provisional application 60/089,212 filed 15 June 1998, however the continuing data as amended 16 April 2001 does not reflect this claim.

(2) the specification lacks a statement of --We claim:--, (see MPEP 608.01(m)).

Appropriate correction is required.

7. The specification and drawings have not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification or drawings. Applicant should note the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.52, 37 CFR § 1.74, § 1.75, § 1.84(o,p(5)), § 1.121(a)-1.121(f) & § 1.121(h)-1.121(i).

8. Claims 1-27 & 38-63 re rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8.1 In regard to claims 1-27 & 38-63 are, although one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention would known how to accomplish each of the individual recited actions/functions from the language of these claims, since, there is no clear and definite interconnection between one or more of the recited limitations of these claims, one of ordinary skill could not determine from the language of these claims whether or not they are in fact making and/or using the claimed invention. In this regard it is noted that from the language of these claims it is vague, indefinite and unclear:

A) in regard to claims 1, 13, 38 & 50, and why the "at least part of the authorization code" is verified, since the invention as recited in these claims is not affected in any way by the results of this verification process, that is the postage indicia

would be generated regardless of whether or not there was a change in the “software component” (claims 1 & 38) or “configuration” (claims 13 & 50).

B) in regard to claims 21 & 57, and:

(1) where and what originates the “request”, since the invention as recited in this claim requires the “authorization code” to be generated by an external system in response to an “request” regardless of whether or not the receiving device originated the request, hence a potentially unrelated device may receive the “authorization code”, which may be meaningless, since this code involves the current feature setting of the device; and

(2) why the “feature options” are effected, since the invention as recited in this claim does not require the “authorization code” to be verified before effecting the change in the feature set as disclosed.

8.2 In regard to claims 9, 11 & 19, are confusing since the phrases “computer where the memory is in, wherein” (claim 9) and “(PSD) where the computer is in, wherein” (claims 11 & 19) are lacking text and hence the scope and meaning of this claim can not be determined.

8.3 Claims not specifically mentioned above, inherit the defects of the base claim through dependency. For the above reason(s), applicant has failed to particularly point out what is regarded as the invention.

9. 35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

“Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title”.

9.1 Claims 1-27 & 38-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention as claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

9.1.1 As set forth by the Court in:

A) In re Musgrave 167 USPQ 280 at 289-290 (CCPA 1970), “We cannot agree with the Board that these claims (all the steps of which can be carried out by the disclosed apparatus) are directed to non-statutory processes merely because some or all of the steps therein can also be carried out in or with

the aid of the human mind or because it may be necessary for one performing the process to think. All that is necessary, in our view, to make a sequence of operational steps a statutory "process" within 35 U.S.C. 101 is that it be in the technological arts so as to be in consonance with the Constitutional purpose to promote the progress of "useful arts." Cons. Art. 1, sec. 8.", {emphasis added}; and

B) In re Sarkar 100 USPQ 132 @ 136-137 (CCPA 1978), echoing the Board of Appeals stated in regard to claim 14 "14. A method of locating an obstruction in an open channel to affect flow in a predetermined manner comprising:

- a) obtaining the dimensions of said obstruction which affect the parameters of flow;
- b) constructing a mathematical model of at least that portion of the open channel in which said obstruction is to be located in accordance with the method of claim 1 using those dimensions obtained in step (a) above;
- c) adjusting the location of said obstruction within said mathematical model until the desired effect upon flow is obtained in said model; and thereafter
- d) constructing said obstruction within the actual open channel at the specified adjusted location indicated by the mathematical model.";

and "Concerning claims 14-39 and the significance of "post-solution activity," like building a bridge or dam, the board concluded: While it is true that the final step in each of these claims makes reference to the mathematical result achieved by performing the prior recited steps, we consider the connection to be so tenuous that the several steps recited in each claim when considered as a whole do not constitute a proper method under the statute.", {emphasis added}.

9.1.2 Further, it is noted in regard to claims 14-39 of Sarkar, although step (d) of claim 14 of Sarkar references the result of step (c) of claim 14 of Sarkar it is clear from the language of

step (c) of claim 14 of Sarkar that multiple adjustments to the location of the obstruction are required to be made until a location with the desired effect has been determined. Hence, the reference to constructing the obstruction at the “specified adjusted location” in step (d) of claim 14 of Sarkar is vague, indefinite and unclear in regard to which one of the possible multiple adjusted locations of the obstruction that were used during step (c) of claim 14 of Sarkar would be used when constructing the obstruction as required by step (d) of Sarkar. Therefore, without a clear connection between step (d) of Sarkar and the remaining steps of claim 14 of Sarkar, the Board of Appeals and the Court held that these claims were not a process with in the meaning of process as used in 35 U.S.C. § 101 and hence were directed to non statutory subject matter.

9.1.3 As can be seen from claims 1-27 & 38-63, these claims are directed to a series of devices for performing various functions or steps/actions/functions, which as set forth above in regard to the rejection of claims 1-27 & 38-63 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 2nd paragraph, are not clearly and definitely interconnected to one another and therefore do not provide an operative useful machine/system or method/process with in the meaning of machine or process as used in 35 U.S.C. § 101.

9.2 Claims 1-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention as claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter, since:

- A) in regard to claims 1-27 & 38-63, these claims fail to comply with the “requirements this title, namely 35 U.S.C. § 112 2nd paragraph as set forth above.
- B) in regard to claims 1-72, these claims fail to comply with the “requirements this title, namely 35 U.S.C. § 103 as set forth below.

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a

person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

(c) Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

10.1 Claims 1-31 & 38-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Haines et al (5,077,660 or 5,107,455) in view of Obrea (4,785,417) and as evidenced by Hall (T104,003).

10.1.1 In regard to claims 1, 5, 6, 13, 14, 16, 21-31, 38, 42, 43, 50, 51 & 57-66, either Haines et al ('660 or '455) a computer implemented method/system of remotely configuring postage meters to perform various functions and/or to include various types of software and/or internal/external hardware devices, for example, a scale. It is noted that in order for the systems of either Haines et al ('660 or '455) to perform the tasks associated with postage metering, at least one software component must be stored in the memory of the system, where the software component would control the sequence of operations required for the hardware components of the system to perform the task of postage metering. Further, when the operator of the systems of either Haines et al ('660 or '455) wishes to change the configuration of the software and hardware components of the system of either Haines et al ('660 or '455), then the system would generate a configuration request for the new configuration. The configuration request that includes an indication of both the old configuration and the new configuration of the software and hardware components of the system as well as data to verify identify the operator is then sent to a remote device over a suitable communications network. If the remote device verifies the authority of the operator and the system to be reconfigured may be reconfigured as requested, then an authorization to reconfigure the system is generated. After the system of either Haines et al ('660 or '455) receives the authorization to reconfigure the postage metering system would authenticate the authorization code and if the authorization code is authenticated then system of either Haines et al ('660 or '455) would enable the various

software and hardware components of the postage metering system as indicated in the authorized reconfiguration request which is then stored. Once the system has been reconfigure, then the system may including an accounting unit or PSD can perform the functions of a postage metering system and generate and print postage indicia. At this point it is noted that the various codes are encrypted.

10.1.2 It is noted that neither Haines et al ('660 nor '455) detects of a change in the software component during the verification before proceeding with the generation of a postage indicia, however, Obrea ('417) in the environment of verifying the proper operation of a software component of a device may be monitored by periodically comparing a "password" that associated with the software component and is stored in a different software component. In the system of Obrea ('417) a stored expected password is compared to data from the software component and if the comparison results in a match, then the system is operating properly otherwise a change/error has been detected and the operation of the system is stopped. Since the operator of the system of either Haines et al ('660 or '455) would not want the system to become unstable and be out of control, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention that the postage metering system of either Haines et al ('660 or '455) could be modified to use a method of checking the proper operation of the system as taught by Obrea ('417).

10.1.3 In regard to claims 2-4, 15, 39-41 & 52, and the version number, since the configuration code indicates what features the system has and can be used, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention that the configuration code of either Haines et al ('660 or '455) would include an indication of the version number.

10.1.4 In regard to claims 7, 8, 44 & 45, and the type of data error checking information, since the system of either Haines et al ('660 or '455) requires information to be communicated from one location to another and the use of a "CRC" or a checksum" are well established methods of checking for errors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention that the systems of either Haines et al ('660 or '455) would include a means/method of checking for errors, see for example the use of a "CRC" for this purpose in Hall et al ('003).

10.1.5 In regard to claims 9-12, 17-20, 46-49 & 53-56, and the nature of the data used to derive the “authorization code”, since the system of either Haines et al ('660 or '455) requires the generation of a particular code for a particular postage metering system and as would be understood by one of ordinary skill the serial number of the processor “processor” or “PSD” are unique to a particular system, hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention that the systems of either Haines et al ('660 or '455) could include the serial number of the processor “processor” or “PSD” to aid in the identification of a particular postage metering system to be reconfigured.

10.2 Claims 32-37 & 67-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Haines et al (5,077,660 or 5,107,455) as modified by Obrea (4,785,417) and interpreted in view of Hall (T104,003) as applied to claims 1-31, 38-66 above and further in view of Smith et al (6,067,582).

10.2.1 In regard to claims 32-34, 36, 37, 67-69, 71 & 72, the system of either Haines et al ('660 or '455) as modified by Obrea ('417) and interpreted in view of Hall ('003) does not bill the operator for the reconfiguration of the system, however, Smith et al (6,067,582) discloses in the environment of remotely configuring/reconfiguring the remote devices over a network the billing of the operator for the services provided to the operator. Since, it is known to:

- A) bill an operator for servers provided to the operator when remotely reconfiguring a system from a central location; and
- B) that a business would not stay in operation very long if it was not paid for the services it provides to a customer,

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention that the systems of either Haines et al ('660 or '455) as modified by Obrea ('417) and interpreted in view of Hall ('003) could be further modified to include the billing of the operator of the system being reconfigured for the services of reconfiguring, since the reconfiguration server would not stay in business with out a source of income.

10.2.2 In regard to claims 35 & 70, see above in regard to claims 2-4, 15, 39-41 & 52.

11. Applicant must supply the prior art cited in the paragraph located:

A) between page 1, line 10, page 2, line 2, "It is commonplace to use ... focused on an Information-Based Indicia Program (IBIP) by the United States Postal Service (USPS), proposing, among other things, new requirements for the format of a postage indicium. Such new requirements were promulgated, e.g., in the "Information Based Indicia Program (IBIP) Open System Indicium Specification," dated August 19, 1998. For instance, ... algorithm. One such public key algorithm may be the Digital Signature Algorithm (DSA) described, e.g., in "Digital Signature Standard (DSS)," FIPS PUB 186, May 19, 1994.";

B) at page 2, lines 3-11, "In addition, under the IBIP, the requirements of a postal security device (PSD) supporting the creation of the postage indicium are specified, e.g., in the "Information Based Indicia Program (IBIP) Open System postal security Device (PSD) specification," dated August 19, 1998. In accordance ... postal fund stored therein in a secure manner."; and

C) at page 9, lines 9-30, "System 100 in this instance may be ... the United states Postal Service (USPS) Information Based Indicia Program (IBIP) specification, namely, the "Information Based Indicia Program (IBIP) Open System Indicium Specification," dated August 19, 1998. To that end, secure memory 200 also includes a well-known digital signature algorithm (DSA) described, e.g., in "Digital Signature Standard (DSS)," FIPS PUB 186, May 19, 1994; and a private ... such as the RSA or Elliptic Curve algorithm may be used.".

12. The examiner has cited prior art of interest, for example:

A) Taylor et al (4,812,994) which discloses that the ID and password of an user may be used to define what functions of a device the user may access.

B) Abumehdi (5,206,812) which discloses that the communications port of a system may need to be reconfigured in order for the system to communicate with other devices.

C) the Business wire article discloses that the configuration of networked remote devices may be remotely verified from a central location.

D) Hornbucke (5,388,212) which discloses that programs may be downloaded via a network from a remote location and billing data for the use of the downloaded program may be uploaded via the network to the remote site.

E) Abumehdi (5,508,933) which discloses the sequence of operation commonly carried out by the accounting unit and printing unit of a postage metering system.

F) Sanders (5,734,831) which discloses that the proper installation and configuration of software that is run on a networked remote computer may be monitored, controlled and administrated from a central location over the network.

G) Hansen (5,838,907) discloses that the remote devices of a network may be remotely configured, monitored and administrated from a central location.

H) Schwartz et al (WO 99/16023) discloses that a graphical symbol may be used to represent encoded information.

I) Frailong et al (6,012,100) discloses that the remote devices of a network may be remotely configured and monitored from a network server.

J) Larose et al (6,108,420) discloses that encrypted signatures may be used to verify that the configuration and software installed on the remote devices of a network are authentic have not been tampered with.

K) Chen et al (6,195,694) discloses that the remote devices of a network may be remotely configured to perform various tasks by a network server.

13. The shorten statutory period of response is set to expire 3 (three) months from the mailing date of this Office action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Cosimano whose telephone number is (703) 305-9783. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30am to 6:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss, can be reached on (703)-308-2702. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

- 14.1 The fax phone number for UNOFFICIAL/DRAFT FAXES is (703) 746-7240.
- 14.2 The fax phone number for OFFICIAL FAXES is (703) 872-9306.
- 14.3 The fax phone number for AFTER FINAL FAXES is (703) 872-9306.

02/02/05

Edward Cosimano
Edward R. Cosimano
Primary Examiner A.U. 3629